

## **REMARKS**

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 4-8, 22-26 and 36-39 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-3, 9-21 and 27-35 are canceled by this amendment. Claims 36-39 are added as new claims. No new matter has been added.

Applicants note that a number of editorial amendments have been made to the specification for grammatical and general readability purposes. No new matter has been added.

### **I. Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 4-6 and 22-24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants have rewritten claims 4, 6, 22 and 24 in independent form, thereby placing these claims in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 24, Applicants note that this claim depended from claim 20, which in turn depended from claim 19. Applicants note, however, that in order to provide proper antecedent basis the phrases “the playback start point” and “the playback end point”, that claim 21 was also incorporated into rewritten claim 24.

Regarding claims 4, 6, 22 and 24, Applicants note that the phrase “being different to the first attribute” has been changed to --being different than the first attribute--, and also, in claims 22 and 24, Applicants note that the phrase “step for” has been changed to --step of--.

Claim 5 depends from claim 4, claims 7 and 8 depend from claim 6, claim 24 depends from claim 23, and claims 25 and 26 depend from claim 24. Regarding new claims 36-39, Applicants note that claims 36 and 37 are identical to claims 7 and 8, but depend from rewritten

claim 4, and that claims 38 and 39 are identical to claims 25 and 26, but depend from rewritten claim 22. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

## **II. Claim Rejections**

Claims 1, 19, 32 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Suito et al. (U.S. 6,937,658); claims 1 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Masanari et al. (JP 2000-069414); claims 2, 3, 7, 14, 15, 20, 21 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suito et al. in view of Ryan (U.S. 5,574,787); claims 8 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suito et al. in view of Ryan, and further in view of Iggulden et al. (U.S. 5,692,093); claims 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suito et al. in view of Ryan, and further in further view of Masanari et al.; and claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suito et al. in view of Ryan and Masanari et al., and further in view of Iggulden et al.

As noted above, claims 1-3, 14-21, 32 and 34 have been canceled by this amendment, thereby rendering the above-noted rejections moot. Also as noted above, claims 7 and 8 have been amended so as to depend from rewritten claim 6, and claims 25 and 26 have been amended so as to depend from rewritten claim 24.

### III. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Tokuo NAKATANI et al.

By: Kenneth W. Fields  
Kenneth W. Fields  
Registration No. 52,430  
Attorney for Applicants

KWF/dib  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
May 22, 2006